



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,971	09/09/2003	James R. Hager	H0003015DIV	4131
128	7590	05/10/2004	EXAMINER	
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. 101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			ALSOMIRI, ISAM A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3662	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/657,971	HAGER ET AL.
	Examiner Isam A Alsomiri	Art Unit 3662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 and 21-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 13-20 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 12-20, drawn to a radar signal processing circuit, classified in class 342, subclass 194.
- II. Claims 11 and 21-23, drawn to a filter including calculating center frequency and the bandwidth of the filter, classified in class 342, subclass other than 194.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because a radar signal processing circuit including a processor configured to determine a center frequency is distinct from a filter. The subcombination has separate utility such as controlling or calculating a center frequency and a bandwidth of a filter.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Group II above is further restricted as follows:

- III. Claims 21-23, drawn to controlling swath (within an antenna beam) frequency and bandwidth based on aircraft velocity and the charge time of a filter, classified in class 342, subclass 81.
- IV. Claim 11, drawn to a calculating a filter center frequency and bandwidth of a filter, classified in class 342, subclass 159.

Inventions III and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention III has separate utility such as controlling a swath filter center frequency/Bandwidth based on aircraft's velocity and filter's charge time which is distinct from a first order filter centering on a doppler frequency. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Robert Slenker Reg. No. 45,112 on April 26, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 12-20. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 11 and 21-23 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 12 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,674,397. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the last limitation in the present application "a processor configured to determine a center frequency for said band pass filter" is inherent in claim 21. Claim 21 claims "a radar signal processing

circuit comprising: ... a band pass filter centered on the doppler frequency"; therefore, it's inherent that the processor determines the center frequency of the band pass filter, otherwise it would not be centered on the doppler frequency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hager et al.

US 6,362,776 in view of Hager US 6,025,800 and Wicks et al. US 5,499,030. Hager '776 discloses in figure 2 a radar signal processing circuit comprising: a radar gate correlation circuit 36 configured to sample radar data at a sampling rate; a correlation bass pass filter 38; a band pass filter centered on the doppler frequency 42; and a processor configured to determine a center frequency for said band pass filter [45,46]. Hager does not teach a mixer configured to down sample an in-phase component and a quadrature component of the filtered signal to a doppler frequency, however, extracting the inphase and quadrature is well known with radar systems and phase comparison. Hager '800 teaches a mixer 45 configured to down sample an in-phase component and a quadrature component of the filtered signal to a doppler frequency (see figure 5). It would have been obvious to modify Hager776's system to include the mixer of

Hager800 to simplify processing of the signals and to present the spectrum accurately within the modulation bandwidth.

Furthermore, Hager '776 correlation bass pass filer 38 is not configured to filter non-zero gated radar return samples and ignore zero amplitude samples. However, sampling the non-zero returns and ignoring the zero returns is well known. Wicks teaches ignoring zero amplitude samples (see col. 5 lines 39-55). It would have been obvious to modify Hager '776 to process the non-zero returns and to ignore zero returns to speed up the processing time.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art cited to (Hager et al. '697; Vehrs, Jr.) show various digital doppler processors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isam A Alsomiri whose telephone number is 703-305-5702. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas H Tarcza can be reached on 703-306-4171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Isam Alsomiri



JOHN B. SOTOMAYOR
PRIMARY EXAMINER

April 27, 2004